DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 133 CE 015 182

AUTHOR Knaples, Gene C.; Milliken, W. James
TITLE An Exploratory Study of the Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Work Values in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Agricultural Experiment Station.
REPORT NO MP-916
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 93p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Behavioral Science Research; Extension Agents; Individual Development; Instructional Staff; *Job Satisfaction; Organizational Climate; *Psychological Patterns; State Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Employment; Teacher Motivation; *Values

ABSTRACT

Two hundred seventy-two faculty members of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service were surveyed tc determine their work values and explore possible relaticnships between work values and job satisfaction. The survey instruments used were Values for Working and County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory. The results, based on 262 responses, are as follows: there were differences in values system orientation and level of job satisfaction among Maryland Extension faculty; there was a relationship between work values and job satisfaction; eight factors contributing to variance in job satisfaction among the faculty were identified (achievement, supervision, salary, reporting, responsibility, advancement, recognition, and working conditions); faculty work values (based on the theoretical framework of Hughes and Flowers) were found to be highest in the existential value orientation followed by sociocentric, manipulative, conformist, tribalistic, and egocentric; a significant relaticnship exists between the egocentric values system and job satisfaction; and, finally, research findings of Hughes and Flowers which showed that disparity in values system orientation between management and employees will lead to lower job satisfaction were supported. (This report contains thirty-three data analysis tables. The survey questionnaires are appended.) (EM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154133

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF JOB SATISFACTION TO WORK VALUES IN THE MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

GENE C. WHAPLES
W. JAMES MILLIKEN

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gene C. Whaples

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CE 015 182

MP 916
AUGUST 1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are indebted to Dr. Einar R. Ryden, Dr. Clifford L. Nelson, Dr. V. Allan Bandel, Dr. James W. Longest, Dr. Elwyn E. Deal, Dr. Bruce W. Sorter and Dr. Ed Reeves for their suggestions.

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Jeffrey Owings for help with the statistics and computer programs.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Charles L. Hughes and to Dr. Vincent S. Flowers for their permission to use the Values for Working questionnaire and many valuable suggestions for the study. In addition, Dr. Pauline Frances Calloway is thanked for her permission to use the County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory.

Contribution number 5337 and Miscellaneous Publication number 916 of the Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station.

The Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station is an equal opportunity employer. Similarly, the knowledge gained through its research program is available to the public without regard to race, color, creed, national origin, sex or religion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Problem	3
Objectives	5
Questions	5
Definitions	6
CHAPTER 2	
REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	7
Values	7
Theoretical Base for Study	8
Disparate Work Values and Job Satisfaction	12
Summary	12
CHAPTER 3	
METHODOLOGY	14
Subjects	14
Instruments	14
Design	16
Procedures	16
Analysis	17

Table Of Contents
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS 18

Subjects 18
Questions 18
Question 1 21
Question 2 34
Question 3 51

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 55

Summary 55
Conclusions 56
Implications 60
Recommendations for Further Research 61

LITERATURE CITED 62

APPENDIX 64

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Level of Existence as Theorized by Clare W. Graves	10
2	Values for Working as Theorized by Hughes and Flowers	13
3	Questionnaire Response to Work Values and Job Satisfaction Survey, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	19
4	Demographic Data, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976, Completing Questionnaires	20
5	Distribution of Raw Scores Among Six Value Systems Orientation, Maryland Extension Faculty, 1976	22
6	Chi Square Test of Association Showing Relationships Between Work Values and Job Assignment, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	23
7	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Job Assignment Association with Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	24
8	Chi Square Test of Association of Work Values Between County Chairpersons and Other County Faculty, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	25
9	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - County Chairpersons and Non-County Chairpersons Association With Conformist Work Values	26
10	Chi Square Measure of Association Between Years of Experience and Values Systems, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	27

List Of Tables
(Continued)

Table		Page
11	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Conformist Value System by Years of Experience, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	27
12	Chi Square Measure of Association Between Sex and Value System, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976 . . .	28
13	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests Among Sex and Value Systems, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	29
14	Chi Square Measures of Association Between Age of Respondents and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	30
15	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association - Conformist Value System by Age, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	30
16	Chi Square Test of Association Between Educational Level and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	31
17	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Educational Level and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	32
18	Chi Square Test of Association Between Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	33
19	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	33
20	Chi Square Test of Association Between Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty with a Doctorate, 1976	34
21	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Manipulative Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty with Doctorate, 1976	34

List Of Tables
(Continued)

Table		Page
22	Means and Standard Deviations of Job Satisfaction Items Before Factor Analysis of Inventory, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	37
23	Summary of Rotated Factor Loadings for Factor Analysis of 47 Items in Eight Factors of Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	38
24	Internal Consistency of Job Satisfaction Factors from Factor Analysis of Job Satisfaction Inventory, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	44
25	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association of Job Assignment With Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	46
26	Chi Square Test of Association Between Job Assignment and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	47
27	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association Between Job Assignment and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	48
28	Chi Square Test of Association Between Demographic Data and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	50
29	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association of Age and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	50
30	Chi Square Test of Association Between Values Systems and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	51
31	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association Between the Egocentric Value System and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976 . . .	52

List Of Tables
(Continued)

Table		Page
32	Chi Square Test of Association Between Values Systems and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	53
33	Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association Between Values of Working and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976	54

APPENDIX

I	Research Instrument	64
II	Questionnaire to Panel of Experts	77

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF JOB SATISFACTION TO WORK VALUES IN THE MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

by

Gene C. Whaples and W. James Milliken[1]

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Extension administrators share a major concern for having qualified people, with high job satisfaction and morale, employed in positions that are essential to the organization. Giegold and Skelton phrase the problem:

> Poor morale, recognized or not, contributes to increased personnel turnover, lowered effectiveness, and most importantly an intensified struggle to stay fully staffed.[2]

Annual recruitment to keep all positions filled and the ensuing disruption of programs from turnovers is one of the major problems of the Cooperative Extension Service. Human resources are the most important resource of an organization such as Extension. Bruce points this out:

> Evidence suggests that the manner in which resources are assembled and the way in which they are managed can

---

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland and County Chairman, Extension Agent, Agricultural Science respectively.

[2]Giegold, William C. and William E. Skelton. "Pinpointing Morale Problems". Journal of Extension, XVI: 6-9. May-June 1976.

have an important bearing on the total and sustained productivity of an organization. This appears especially to be the case in organizations whose output depends largely on the contribution of individual members of its staff.....[3]

The Cooperative Extension Service is staffed with agents and specialists of diverse background, training, interests, values and attitudes.

Management of Extension personnel involves all those decisions and policies that will provide educational leadership for professionally competent individuals who have attained successes in their own right.[4] Achieving organizational goals involves channeling and managing the diverse human resources and individual values that make up the organization.

All organizations, in order to function, must have goals either implicit in tradition and culture or explicit through a management by objectives system. The goals of the organization also relate to the values and psychological needs of the personnel. Not only do goals of the organization and individual values and needs sometimes conflict, but satisfaction of the workers may suffer when administrative values and goals conflict with those of the individual worker.

Management research shows that the goals, procedures and styles of leadership within most organizations are determined by managers of similar value systems.[5] If organizational goals are determined by administrators or managers with value systems incompatible with employees, alienation of employees and job dissatisfaction may result.

Research in industry has been directed toward isolating and defining the characteristics of dissatisfied workers and the factors that influence job satisfaction. Studies indicate that some aspects of the job may lead to satisfaction while others lead to dissatisfaction.

---

[3]Bruce, Robert L. and G. L. Carter, Jr. "Administrative Climate". Journal of Cooperative Extension, V: 7-14. Spring 1976.

[4]Mees, Carl F. "County Extension Administration". Journal of Cooperative Extension, I: 85-92. Summer 1963.

[5]Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "Toward Existentialism in Management". The Conference Board Record, XII: 60-64. September 1975.

Differences among individuals account for varying degrees of influence among the factors of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The total satisfaction or dissatisfaction may vary from period to period or as a result of changes in job content. Individual differences may be related to the value orientation of the individual and the relationship of that individual to others in his work group with different value systems.

Specifically, this study is concerned with establishing benchmark data for future job satisfaction and management studies and possible administrative policies to fit people to the jobs and the organization, and thus alleviate those conditions leading to employee dissatisfaction.

Significance of the Problem

The Cooperative Extension Service is the largest publicly-supported informal adult education organization in the United States, and the only national system of adult education.[6] The organization was created in 1914 when Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act. The major function of the staff of the organization is to involve local people in activities and educational programs to help them to use new and needed information. Malcolm Knowles described the Cooperative Extension Service in this way:

> A unique cooperative venture between federal, state and county governments, with the state land grant colleges serving as administrative centers, the Cooperative Extension Service is probably the single largest adult education enterprise in the world.[7]

From an early organization of one or two staff members per county and a very "flat" hierarchical structure, Extension has emerged into a large bureaucratic complex. Whereas agents and specialists were accustomed to a nearly one-on-one style of work and communication, today job content has enlarged to embody rapid communications, ever-pyramiding informational delivery, and an expanded clientele. In spite of the increase in job content and job complexity, the individual Extension worker has nearly the same individual freedom of action as his predecessors.

---

[6]Boone, Edgar J. "The Cooperative Extension Service". Handbook of Adult Education, Robert M. Smith, George F. Aker, and J. R. Kidd, editors, (New York: The MacMillan Company), p. 265. 1970.

[7]Knowles, Malcolm S. "The Field of Operations in Adult Education". Adult Education - Outline of an Emerging Field of University Study, Gale Jensen, A. A. Liveright and Wilbur Hallenbeck, editors, (Adult Education Association of the USA), p. 44. 1964.

By the very nature of the organization, Cooperative Extension is unique. It's an agency "charged with responsibility in adult and youth education, without any compulsory hold on its clientele."[8] Agents and specialists are dispersed throughout the state, usually without any direct contact with supervision. To be successful the agent must be a self-starter, or in Maslow's terms, a "self-actualizer".

Amend ties dissatisfaction in work to performance:

> A dissatisfied person, performing inadequately on the job, is a waste to himself and his organization. The goal of personnel administration should be to properly place individuals for maximum utilization of their capabilities.[9]

Available evidence[10] indicates that Extension workers have an altruistic value of work; however, they are influenced in their decision to work for Extension and the satisfaction they achieve from work by the same financial, security and other job satisfaction factors as everyone else.

While the stated values of the Extension Service focus on service to clientele and benefits to clientele from programs, the efficient delivery of these programs is a function of the motivation and satisfaction of the individual worker in Extension, each with his or her own value orientation toward work.[11]

Research by Hughes et al[12] integrates the theories of Herzberg[13] and Graves[14] into a theory and structure of values that form a

---

[8]Amend, Edwin H. "Supervision: Motivating, Not Controlling". Journal of Extension, VIII: 17-24. Winter 1970.

[9]Ibid., p. 19.

[10]King, Emily E. "Relationships of Personal Value Systems to a Measure of Job Satisfaction Among Personnel of the Florida Agricultural Extension Service". (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin), 1961.

[11]Bruce. Op. cit., p. 9.

[12]Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "Shaping Personnel Strategies to Disparate Value Systems". Personnel, p. 9. March-April 1973.

[13]Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B. F. Snyderman. Motivation to Work. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1964.

[14]Graves, Clare W. "Levels of Existence: An Open System Theory of Values". Journal of Humanistic Psychology, X: 131-155. 1970.

framework for this investigation of work-related values and for strategies to enhance the goals of the organization as well as the goals and satisfaction of the employee.

Objectives

The major objective of this study is to determine what work values are held by the faculty of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service.

Other objectives are:

1) To provide a benchmark study and a data base for future job satisfaction studies and possible changes in administrative policies to alleviate problem areas in job satisfaction.

2) To provide a benchmark study for future management studies and administrative policies to fit personnel to jobs and the organization.

3) To determine if Herzberg's elements of job satisfaction from his hygiene motivation theory are associated with the Hughes *et al* adaptation of Graves' theory. Questions to be answered by the study are presented below.

Questions

The study was regarded as exploratory; hence, no hypotheses were offered.

The following questions were asked:

Question 1:

Are there differences of values system orientation among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

Question 2:

Are there differences in level of job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

Question 3:

Is there a relationship between the values system orientation and level of job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

Definitions

Values. The established ideals of life: objects, customs, ways of acting, and the like that the members of a given society regard as desirable.[15]

Work values. Those ideals of life, customs, ways of acting associated with work that the members of a given society or work group regard as desirable.

Disparate value systems. This refers to the research of Hughes and Flowers.[16] Disparate value systems are those in which conflict and dissatisfaction may occur among employees when administration and supervision or the operational organizational value systems are centered at certain other levels.

Existential management. "The existential approach to management assumes that all kinds of attitudes toward work are acceptable, and that each individual has the right to retain whatever values he or she holds. It is characterized by behavior, policies, procedures and styles of leadership that accommodate such diversity of values."[17]

Cooperative Extension Service, also Extension. An organization created by the passage of the 1914 Smith-Lever Act to "....take practical information from the land-grant colleges and the Department of Agriculture to the people of the United States in their local environment."[18]

Administrative and supervisory staff. Those staff charged with straight-line administration and supervision of professional staff. This includes: the director, the associate and assistant directors, the supervisors and the department heads.

County chairpersons. Those county Extension agents charged with responsibilities in office management.

---

[15]World Book Encyclopedia, (Chicago: Field Enterprise Educational Corporation). 1976.

[16]Hughes and Flowers. Personnel. Op. cit., p. 20.

[17]Hughes and Flowers. The Conference Board Record. Op. cit., p. 62.

[18]Federal Extension Service. A People And A Spirit. (A condensation of the report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension. Fort Collins: Printing and Publication Service, Colorado State University), p. 8. November 1968.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Values

Values have gained importance as an area of concern and research. According to Robin Williams: "Values are not the concrete goals of action, but rather the criteria by which goals are chosen. Values are important, not trivial or of slight concern."[1] Kurt Baier states:

> It is... generally recognized that in the determination of people's behavior their values play an important role and that the direction in which values change importantly affects the welfare of individuals and of societies.[2]

Ginsberg feels that values play an important role in changes that take place in society, and a society such as ours which is experiencing a rapid diversification of values will create patterns of increasing change. Values, attitudes and the orientation of the people of a country determine patterns of business and development of economics.[3] Value research is reported as "gloomy" by Baier, who states that:

> Empirical investigators do not have available to them a conceptual apparatus suitable even for specifying the values,

---

[1]Williams, Robin. American Society. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), p. 374. 1957.

[2]Baier, Kurt. "The Concept of Value". Value Theory in Philosophy and Social Science, Ervin Lazlow and James B. Wilbur, editors, (Gordon and Breach Science Publishers), p. 1. 1973.

[3]Ginsberg, Eli. "Man and His Work". Managing People at Work, Dale S. Breach, editor. (New York: MacMillan Company, Inc.). 1971.

value systems, or value orientation of particular individuals or societies, at any given time, or changes in these values taking place over a period of time, let alone any theories predicting and explaining such changes, and least of all any understanding of how to assess the desirability or understanding of any anticipated changes in such values.[4]

There have been attempts, however, to systematize value orientation into theory.

Rokeach makes the distinction that a value is:

> ...an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.[5]

A number of values interacting and influencing the behavior of an individual are often referred to as a value system.

A value system is "...an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance."[6] Yet, as important as values are, the state of the art of values is still developing.

Theoretical Basis for Study

The theoretical framework upon which this study was based includes Maslow's motivation theory, the levels of existence theory of Clare Graves, Frederick Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, and the work values concept of management as developed by Hughes, Flowers, et al, from Graves' theory.

---

[4]Baier. Op. cit., p. 4.

[5]Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. (New York: The Free Press, MacMillan), p. 5. 1973.

[6]Rokeach. Op. cit., p. 5.

1. Maslow's motivation theory.[7] Both Graves' levels of existence theory and Herzberg's motivation theory are derived in part from the theory of motivation of Abraham Maslow. His theory organizes five sets of basic needs into a hierarchy. At the lowest level of needs are the physiological needs such as thirst, hunger and sex. When all the needs of man are unfulfilled, his behavior is dominated by the physiological needs. As these become satisfied, a higher order of needs, the safety needs, emerges. These safety needs encompass such items as shelter and protection.

The next higher level of needs are those associated with love, affection and belongingness. At this level, the individual seeks friends, wife or children. A fourth level of needs is that of esteem. This includes a need for a stable, firmly based, and usually high self-evaluation, self-esteem, self-respect, and respect for others. The fifth, or highest order of needs emerges when all others have been satisfied. This is the need for self-fulfillment or self-actualization. This is the movement of the individual toward actual realization of his potential.

Needs operate within a system of priorities. The lower level needs must be satisfied before an individual can experience the higher level social and self-actualization needs. Achievement of the needs of each level dominates the individual's behavior until the needs at that level are satisfied, thus permitting the individual to strive to meet the needs of the next highest level.

The satisfaction of needs and ability to move into the next level is also a dominant feature of Graves' theory, explored in the next section.

Graves' levels of existence theory.[8] Graves developed a theory enlarging upon Maslow's hierarchical needs theory that advocates that the psychological growth of mature man is a progressive subordination of older lower-level behavioral systems to higher systems. This theory holds that human beings exist at different levels of existence. Each successive level is a stage through which man passes. (Table 1)

---

[7]Maslow, Abraham. New Knowledge in Human Values. (New York: Harper). 1959.

[8]Graves, Clare W. "Human Nature Prepares for a Momentous Leap". The Futurist. April 1974.

Table 1. Levels of Existence as Theorized by Clare W. Graves

LEVELS OF EXISTENCE

First subsistence level (A-N): Man at this level is motivated only by imperative periodic physiological needs. He seeks to stabilize his individual body functions. This level of existence is perfectly adequate to preserve the species, but it is seldom seen today except in rare instances, as in the Tasaday tribe, or in pathological cases.

Second Subsistence Level (B-O): At this level, man seeks social (tribal) stability. He strongly defends a life he does not understand. He believes that his tribal ways are inherent in the nature of things, and resolutely holds to them. He lives by totems and taboos.

Third Subsistence Level (C-P): Raw, self-assertive individualism comes to the fore at this level, and the term "Machiavellian" may be used. This is the level where "might makes right" thinking prevails. There is an agressive expression of man's lusts - openly and unabashedly by the "haves," more covertly and deviously by the "have nots." Anyone dealing with the C-P type must resort to the threat of sheer naked force to get him to do anything.

Fourth Subsistence Level (D-Q): At this level, man perceives that living in this world does not bring ultimate pleasure, and also sees that rules are prescribed for each class of people. Obedience to these rules is the price that one must pay for a more lasting life. D-Q people generally subscribe to some dogmatic system, typically a religion. These are the people who believe in "living by the Ten Commandments," obeying the letter of the law, etc. They work best within a rigid set of rules, such as army regulations.

Fifth Subsistence Level (E-R): People at the E-R level want to attain mastery of the world by learning its secrets rather than through brute force (as at the C-P level). They believe that the man who comes out on top in life fully deserves his good fortune, and those who fail are ordained to submit to the chosen few. E-R people tend to be somewhat dogmatic, but they are pragmatic, too, and when they find something that works better they'll change their beliefs.

Sixth Subsistence Level (F-S): Relating self to other human selves and to his inner self is central to man at the F-S level. Unlike the E-R people, F-S man cares less for material gain or power than he does for being liked by other people. He's ready to go along with whatever everyone else thinks is best. He likes being in groups, the danger is that he gets so wrapped up in group decision-making that little work gets done.

First Being Level (G-T): The first being level is tremendously different from the earlier subsistence levels, says Graves. Here as man, in his never-ending spiral, turns to focus once again on the external world and his use of power in relation to it, the compulsiveness and anxiousness of the subsistence ways of being are gone. Here man has a basic confidence that he, through a burgeoning intellect freed of the constriction of lower level anxieties, can put the world back together again. If not today, tomorrow. Here he becomes truly a cooperative individual and ceases being a competitive one. Here he truly sees our interdependence with all things of this universe. And here he uses the knowledge garnered through his first-ladder trek in efforts to put his world together again, systemically.

Table 1. (Continued)

Second Being Level (H-U): People operating in an H-U fashion have been rare in Graves's studies. Almost all of Graves's subjects who so behaved have been in their late fifties and beyond. What typifies them is a "peculiar" paradoxical exploration of their inner world. They treat it as a new toy with which to play. But even though playing with it, they are fully aware that they will never know what their inner selves are all about. Graves says this idea is best illustrated by a poem of D. H. Lawrence, "Terra Incognita."

Reproduced by permission of the editors from Clare W. Graves, "Human Nature Prepares for a Momentous Leap". The Futurist, April 1974. World Future Society, 4916 St. Elmo Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

---

3. Motivation-hygiene theory of Herzberg.[9] Frederick Herzberg holds that the lower order and higher order needs of man do not operate on a single continuum. The lower order, or hygiene needs, only motivate up to a level of diminishing return. The higher order self-actualization needs have a much greater motivation potential as compared to lower-order needs. Hygiene-satisfiers, then, motivate to a more limited level than motivation satisfiers.

Meaningless or repetitive work that offers limited opportunity for expression of talent may result in hygiene dissatisfaction; conversely, meaningful work which offers opportunity for growth, advancement, achievement, responsibility and recognition inspires motivation above satisfaction of hygiene needs.

Herzberg's theory is a two-factor theory of motivation utilizing the concept of satisfiers and dissatisfiers, or of motivation and hygiene factors.

4. Values for work - Hughes and Flowers.[10] Charles L. Hughes and Vincent S. Flowers offered a theoretical framework for the structure of values combining Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and Dr. Clare Graves' theory of levels of psychological existence.

This research with value systems was conducted, with the assistance of Scott Myers and Susan Myers,[11] with several hundred employees at Texas Instruments,

---

[9]Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. (Cleveland: The World Press) 1966.

[10]Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "Shaping Personnel Strategies to Disparate Value Systems". Personnel, p. 9. March-April 1973.

[11]Flowers, Vincent S. and Charles L. Hughes. "Why Employees Stay". Harvard Business Review. p. 49. July-August 1973.

Dallas, Texas. Hughes and Flowers modified Graves' system of eight levels of existence to a system of seven levels. They indicate that, "People exist at different levels of psychological development, and these levels shape the values they have toward many aspects of life, including work."[12]

They offer a brief description of these value systems based on their research with the Graves theory. (Table 2)

Disparate Work Values and Job Satisfaction

Hughes and Flowers' research indicates that job satisfaction is lowered when there is a mismatch of values of employees with those of supervision.[13]

They state:

> Traditionally and currently, managers with a single value system determine the goals of the organization. Further, the value system of the managers determines the systems and procedures and styles of leadership used to manage employees who are likely to have disparate value systems....[14]

Concerning the organization, Hughes and Flowers point out that a management by objectives system "essentially mirrors the manipulative system philosophy".[15] In addition they propose that quantitative control systems required by management by objectives in the conformist and manipulative (systems 4 and 5) organizational structure decrease motivation in systems 6 and 7 employees.

Disparate value systems are those in which conflict and dissatisfaction may occur among employees when administration and supervision or the operational organizational value systems are centered at certain other levels.

Summary

Hughes and Flowers integrated the theories of Herzberg and Graves into a theoretical framework for the structure of values and study of value implications to organizational management. A person's values shape his perception of life, including work.

Many of the studies of job satisfaction conducted with Extension Service personnel have been based on the theoretical framework of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. The theoretical framework for this study is based on the work of Hughes and Flowers and Herzberg.

---

[12]Hughes and Flowers. Personnel. Op. cit., p. 11.

[13]Hughes anf Flowers. Personnel. Op. cit., pp. 15-19.

[14]Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "New Goals in Personnel". Management by Objectives Journal, Surry, England, 3(4): 26. 1974.

[15]Ibid., p. 21.

Table 2. Values for Working as Theorized by Hughes and Flowers

Values for Working

The following categorizations of psychological levels of development and work values are based on Scott and Susan Myers' adaptation of Clare Graves's theory.

Level 1 - Reactive. This level of psychological development is restricted primarily to infants, people with serious brain deterioration, and certain psychopathic conditions. For practical purposes, employees are not ordinarily found at Level 1.

Level 2 - Tribalistic. These employees are best suited to jobs that offer easy work, friendly people, fair play, and, above all, a good boss. An employee at this level believes that he may not have the best job in the world, but he does as well as others with jobs like his. He likes a boss who tells him exactly what to do and how to do it, and who encourages him by doing it with him.

Level 3 - Egocentric. The two major requirements of a job for this employee are that it pay well and keep people off his back. He does not care for any kind of work that ties him down, but he will do it if he must in order to get some money. Because of the raw, rugged value system of this employee, he needs a boss who is tough, but allows him to be tough too.

Level 4 - Conformist. This employee likes a job which is secure, where the rules are followed, and no favoritism is shown. He feels that he has worked hard for what he has and thinks he deserves some good breaks. Others, he believes, should realize that it is their duty to work. He likes a boss who calls the shots, isn't always changing his mind, and sees to it that everyone follows the rules.

Level 5 - Manipulative. The ideal job for this employee is one which is full of variety, allows some free wheeling and dealing, and offers pay and bonus on the basis of results. He feels he is responsible for his own success and is constantly on the lookout for new opportunities. A good boss for this employee understands the politics of getting the job done, knows how to bargain, and is firm but fair.

Level 6 - Sociocentric. A job which allows for the development of friendly relationships with supervisors and others in the work group appeals to this employee. Working with people toward a common goal is more important than getting caught up in a materialistic rat race. He likes a boss who gets people working in close harmony by being more a friendly person than a boss.

Level 7 - Existential. This employee likes a job where the goals and problems are more important than the money, prestige, or how it should be done. He prefers work of his own choosing that offers continuing challenge and requires imagination and initiative. To him, a good boss is one who gives him access to the information he needs and lets him do the job in his own way.

Reproduced from: Flowers, Vincent S. and Charles L. Hughes. "Why Employees Stay". Harvard Business Review. July-August 1973.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The population selected, instruments, design, procedures and method of analysis are presented in this chapter.

Subjects

The population for this study was the entire professional faculty of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service, including Extension agents, subject matter specialists, program leaders, supervisors and administrators on active duty between October 1 and November 1, 1976. The study was limited to the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service in order to hold constant the organizational structure and policy that would be expected to differ in each state.

Instruments

The two instruments used in this study were the Values for Working questionnaire of Hughes, Flowers, Myers and Myers,[1] and an adaptation of the County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory of Calloway.[2]

---

[1]Flowers, Vincent S., Charles L. Hughes, M. Scott Myers and Susan Myers. "Managerial Values for Working". AMACOM, A Division of American Management Association, p. 14, 1975.

[2]Calloway, Pauline Frances. "An Analysis of Construct Validity of Motivation as it Relates to North Carolina County Agriculture Extension Service Agents". (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, North Carolina State University). 1968.

1. Values for Working questionnaire of Hughes, Flowers, Myers and Myers.[3] Graves' levels of psychological existence[4] was used as a frame of reference to develop research instruments for measuring values in organizations. The Values for Working questionnaire is keyed to workplace attitudes and behavior, and is designed to measure values at levels 2 through 7.[5] Level 1 is not measured since few employees are found at that level.

The questionnaire was developed by testing experimentally-written items and then refining them through correlational analysis on the basis of internal consistency.[6]

The questionnaire was administered with permission of the authors.

2. Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory. This instrument is an adaption of Calloway's (1968) County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory.[7] Calloway developed a questionnaire that would be appropriate for measurement of job satisfaction of County Extension Agents in the North Carolina Agriculture Extension Service.

This instrument, with minor changes necessary because of differences in salary and supervisory structure in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service, was used as a measure of job satisfaction. Some items had phrases inserted in parentheses to adapt the questionnaire to specialists and other state staff.

The Calloway inventory is based on the Herzberg et al (1964) theory of motivation and nine of the job satisfaction dimensions. These nine dimensions are achievement, recognition, the work itself, advancement, responsibility, organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary and working conditions.

The instrument was judged for content validity by Dr. Clifford Nelson, Dr. James Longest, Dr. Bruce Sorter and Dr. Elwyn Deal.

Scoring was modified from that suggested by Calloway. A Likert-type four-response scale was used.

---

[3]Hughes and Flowers. Values for Working. Copyrighted instrument. Dallas, Texas. 1975.

[4]Graves. The Futurist. Op. cit., p. 77.

[5]Flowers, Hughes, Myers and Myers. AMACOM. p. 2.

[6]Flowers, Hughes, Myers and Myers. AMACOM. p. 14.

[7]Calloway. Op. cit., p. 46.

4 = very satisfied
3 = satisfied
2 = dissatisfied
1 = very dissatisfied

If three or fewer items were left blank by a subject, a median scale value of 2.5 was assigned to each blank. If more than three items were left blank, the questionnaire was not included in the analysis. Factor analysis was employed to further validate the instrument.

Design

This research study was exploratory; this type of study is considered an ex post facto field study by Katz who wrote: "The exploratory study attempts to see what is there rather than to predict the relationships that will be found."[8]

Procedures

The Maryland Cooperative Extension Service director's office granted permission to conduct this study.

The three part questionnaire (I - Biographic, II - Values for Working, III - Job Satisfaction Inventory) was pretested with University of Delaware Cooperative Extension employees at the Sussex county, Georgetown, Delaware office, and appropriate changes made.

The revised questionnaire was submitted to five members of the graduate faculty of the University of Maryland for an evaluation of content validity.

The questionnaire was mailed to all members of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service professional faculty. Each questionnaire was mailed with a prestamped addressed envelope in which the questionnaire was to be returned. A cover letter and a self-addressed postal card with an identifying number were included. This card was to have been mailed simultaneously, but separately from the questionnaire. The questionnaire may be found in Appendix I.

---

[8]Katz, Daniel. "Field Studies". Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, L. Festinger and D. Katz, editors. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), p. 74. 1952.

After the questionnaires were returned, response sheets were prepared for data-punch. Follow-up letters and telephone calls were used to improve questionnaire returns.

Analysis

The Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Program was used in data analysis. Computation was accomplished through a grant provided by the Computer Science Center, University of Maryland.

Frequency distribution, percentile distribution and chi square were the methods of analysis; in addition, factor analysis was used to determine the factors present in the Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory of Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study. An analysis of the demographic data of subjects is included in the first section. A discussion of the three questions asked is included in the second section.

Subjects

The professional faculty of the University of Maryland Cooperative Extension Service on active duty between October 1 and November 1, 1976 was surveyed. There were 262 respondents, representing a 96.3 percent response.

Twenty-seven of these respondents had incorrectly responded to the Values for Working portion of the questionnaire. Since there was no legitimate method to provide missing data for this portion, these questionnaires were not used in analysis involving value levels. Table 3 summarizes questionnaire response. The job satisfaction data of these questionnaires were used in the factor analysis portion of the study.

A summary of the demographic data describing the subjects is presented in Table 4.

Questions

This study was considered exploratory; the three questions asked are presented in this section with data as appropriate for each question. The data were analysed by the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) subprogram "CROSSTABS" and chi square. Analysis was performed using the Univac 1108 computer in the University of Maryland Computer Science Center.

In addition to SPSS, the "BASIC" program chi square (CHI- 2*) was used as a chi square contingency test to determine the source of

Table 3. Questionnaire Response To Work Values and Job Satisfaction Survey, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

		County Faculty	State Faculty
Questionnaires Mailed		153	120
1 Agent Resignation		152	
Questionnaire Returns		145	117
Percent of Responses Received		95.3	97.5
No Response		7	3
Questionnaires Useable	(1)	130	105
	(2)	135	114
	(3)	226 total	

(1) Useable with no errors in Values for Working portion of questionnaire.

(2) Useable with three or fewer items missing in job satisfaction portion of questionnaire. The scale median (2.5) was substituted.

(3) Useable for analysis of association among work values and job satisfaction.

Table 4. Demographic Data, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976, Completing Questionnaires

	No Missing Values (1)	Completed
Present Job Assignment	N=235	N=262
4-H Agent	48	52
Agriculture Agent	36	41
Home Economics Agent	36	42
Community and Resource Development Agent	10	10
State Specialist Faculty	81	91
Administrative-Supervisory	24	26
County Chairpersons	22	24
Non-Chairperson County Faculty	108	115
Years of Employment in Extension		
0 to 1	37	39
2 to 5	71	80
6 to 10	34	37
11 to 15	28	32
16 and over	65	73
Not reported		1
Sex		
Male	163	178
Female	72	84
Age		
Under 30	51	60
30 to 39	56	60
40 to 49	62	68
50 to 59	52	58
60 and over	14	16
Level of Formal Education		
Bachelor's degree	31	32
Bachelor's plus additional hours	52	59
Master's degree	36	41
Master's degree plus additional hours	47	53
Advanced Graduate Specialist	4	6
Doctorate	65	71
Hours of Education or other Behavioral Sciences		
0 to 29	137	153
30 and over	72	82
Not reported	26	27

(1) No missing values in Values for Work portion of questionnaire.

association in larger crosstabulations with a significant (.05 level minimum) raw chi square.

Question 1: Are there differences of values systems orientation among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

Scoring. The eight values questions were multiple choice (forced choice) with six possible responses to each question. The respondent was asked to indicate agreement with each of the six possible responses by distrubuting 12 points among them. The more agreement, the more points distributed. It was emphasized that in cases of nonagreement with choices, no points should be assigned to those choices.

The points were summated by value level. The total score should not have exceeded 96. Those cases where the score did not equal 96 were not used in analysis of work values, but were used in analysis of job satisfaction. The summated scores by value level were raw scores for each value level for that subject.

The percentile distributions were arbitrarily divided at the 50th percentile to differentiate between subjects with high and low values for each of the six work values in order to conduct further analysis.

Responses to the eight values questions were summated by value level. The distribution of raw scores of each of the six value systems measured by the instrument (system 2-7) is given in Table 5.

The Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty were predominantly centered in the existential values system with a raw score mean of 30.8, and in the sociocentric values system with a mean of 20.1. Lowest scores were given to the egocentric values system with a mean of 3.2, and the tribalistic values system, 10.3.

There was a wide variation of scores by subject. Existential scores ranged from a low of 9 to a high of 68 out of 96 possible points. Each of the other value systems ranged from a low of zero to scores of 48 or less with the lowest upper range of scores (20) assigned to the egocentric values system.

The chi square statistic was utilized to determine if association exists between demographic groups and the values systems. Data are presented in the following sections.

Work values association with job assignment. The six groups of job assignments, 4-H agents, agricultural agents, home economics agents, community and resource development agents, state subject matter specialists and the administrative job group, were crosstabulated with each of the values systems. The administrative job group consisted

able 5. Distribution of Raw Scores Among Six Value Systems Orientation, Maryland Extension Faculty, 1976

alue System[a]	Min	Percentiles 10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	Max	Mean	Median	S.D.
. Tribalistic	0	3	5	7	8	10	11	12	13	15	34	10.243	10.604	4.873
. Egocentric	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	6	7	20	3.302	2.391	3.503
. Conformist	0	5	9	11	13	15	16	19	21	25	38	15.711	15.458	7.541
. Manipulative	0	5	8	10	12	14	16	18	21	27	46	15.826	14.545	8.422
. Sociocentric	0	9	12	15	17	20	21	24	26	30	48	20.017	19.950	8.326
. Existential	9	18	22	24	27	30	32	35	38	43	68	30.915	30.000	9.831

(a) Value system numbers and names refer to the Hughes and Flowers inventory, Values for Working. Level 1 (Reactive) is not measured since few workers at that level are found in work situations.

of administrators, supervisors and academic department heads in Division I: Agricultural and Life Sciences. The department heads have supervisory duties concerning Extension specialists assigned to their respective departments.

The frequency distribution of raw scores for each value system was divided at the 50th percentile to create two variables with high and low classification. Significance was found in the sociocentric and egocentric values systems. There was no significant difference in the existential, manipulative, conformist and tribalistic value systems associated with job assignment. The results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Chi Square Test of Association Showing Relationships Between Work Values and Job Assignment, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976.

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	4.479	.4826
Sociocentric	18.165	.0027**
Manipulative	6.151	.2918
Conformist	9.346	.0960
Egocentric	16.274	.0061**
Tribalistic	9.032	.1078

**Significant at the .01 level
Degrees of Freedom = 5
N = 235
Missing Cases = 27

A contingency test for each of the work groups was carried out. Frequencies from each of the column cells were compared to frequencies in the row cells in 2 X 2 contingency tables. The significant tests of association are summarized in Table 7.

4-H agents were significantly higher in sociocentrism than the rest of the faculty with the exception of home economics agents and the administrative work group. 4-H agents were also found to be significantly higher in egocentrism than the administrative work group, but not the rest of the faculty. However, the administrative work group was significantly lower in egocentrism than the rest of the faculty.

Table 7. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Job Assignment Association with Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

SOCIOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
4-H Agents	36	12	48
to Rest	86	101	187
Total Column	122	113	235

X^2 = 11.742
Significance = .00099
1 Degree of Freedom

SOCIOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
4-H Agents	36	12	48
to Administration	9	15	24
Total Column	45	27	72

X^2 = 8.067
Significance = .00486
1 Degree of Freedom

EGOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
4-H Agents	36	12	48
to Administration	9	15	24
Total Column	45	27	72

X^2 = 8.067
Significance = .00486
1 Degree of Freedom

EGOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Administration	9	15	24
to Rest	137	74	211
Total Column	146	89	235

X^2 = 5.774
Significance = .0156
1 Degree of Freedom

EGOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
CRD Agents	10	0	10
to Rest	136	89	225
Total Column	146	89	235

X^2 = 4.797
Significance = .0267
1 Degree of Freedom
Less than 5 expected in cell.

In addition, all ten community and resource development agents were in the high group of egocentrism. Less than five were expected in the cell with zero cases. The chi square measure of association in such a case is not valid. Crosstabulation tables are available from the authors.

Value of work association in community chairpersons. County chairpersons and non-chairperson county faculty were crosstabulated with the six work values systems. County chairpersons are administrative heads of the county Extension offices and constitute the lowest level of management in the Maryland Extension hierarchy. County chairpersons were found to be significantly more conformist oriented than the non-chairperson county faculty.

No significant association was found in the existential, sociocentric, manipulative, egocentric or tribalistic values systems with county chairpersons.

The results are summarized in Table 8. The significant chi square contingency tests are found in Table 9.

Table 8. Chi Square Test of Association of Work Values Between County Chairpersons and Other County Faculty, Maryland Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	0.740	.390
Sociocentric	1.662	.197
Manipulative	2.217	.136
Conformist	3.833	.050*
Egocentric	0.414	.520
Tribalistic	1.041	.308

*Significant at .05 level
N = 130
Missing Cases = 15
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 9. Significant Chi Square Contingency Test - County Chairpersons and Non-County Chairpersons Association with Conformist Work Values

CONFORMIST Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
County Chairpersons	15	7	22
Non-County Chairpersons Faculty	46	62	108
Total Column	61	69	130

$X^2 = 3.833$
Significance = .050
1 Degree of Freedom

Work values associated with years of Extension employment. Years of employment in Cooperative Extension work were crosstabulated with each of the six values systems. The years of experience were coded to 0-1 (up to 2 years) of employment with Cooperative Extension; 2-5, 6-10, 11 to 15, and 16 years and over.

Raw chi square findings of the crosstabulations are shown in Table 10. Significant association was found in the conformist value systems by years of experience.

Contingency tests were performed and significant results are reported in Table 11.

Those faculty with 2-5 years of experience in Extension were significantly lower in conformist orientation. Faculty with 11-15 years of experience were significantly higher in conformist orientation, as were those with 16 or more years of experience.

No significant difference was found in the existential, sociocentric, manipulative, egocentric and tribalistic values systems.

Work values associated with sex. Subjects were crosstabulated by sex with each of the work value systems. Female Cooperative Extension Service faculty were more existential and sociocentric than males; males were more manipulative, conformist and tribalistic than females.

Significance was found in the existential, sociocentric, manipulative, conformist and tribalistic value systems. No significant differences between males and females was found in the egocentric value system. The results are summarized in Table 12. Table 13 shows the

Table 10. Chi Square Measure of Association Between Years of Experience and Values Systems, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	8.716	.069
Sociocentric	2.162	.706
Manipulative	2.237	.692
Conformist	18.504	.001***
Egocentric	1.545	.819
Tribalistic	6.548	.162

***Significant at .001 level
N = 235
Missing Cases = 27
4 Degrees of Freedom

Table 11. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Conformist Value System by Years of Experience, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
2-5 years	27	44	71
Compared to Rest	90	74	164
Total Column	117	118	235
X^2 = 4.973			
Significance = .024			
1 Degree of Freedom			
11-15 years	20	8	28
Compared to Rest	97	110	207
Total Column	117	118	235
X^2 = 5.013			
Significance = .024			
1 Degree of Freedom			
16 years or over	42	23	65
Compared to Rest	75	95	170
Total Column	117	118	235
X^2 = 7.104			
Significance = .0078			
1 Degree of Freedom			

Table 12. Chi Square Measure of Association Between Sex and Values Systems, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	9.921	.0016**
Sociocentric	5.290	.021*
Manipulative	4.691	.030*
Conformist	5.580	.018*
Egocentric	0.424	.515
Tribalistic	16.308	.0001****

*Significance at .05 level
**Significance at .01 level
****Significance at .0001 level
1 Degree of Freedom
N = 235
Missing Cases = 27

significant chi square contingency tests.

Work values associated with age. The five groups of age classification, under 30, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 or over, were crosstabulated with each of the six values systems.

Significance was found in the conformist values system. No significant difference was found in the existential, sociocentric, manipulative, egocentric and tribalistic values systems. The results are summarized in Table 14.

Significant chi square contingency test results are found in Table 15. Those faculty under 30 years of age were less conformist. Those between 40 and 49 years of age were highly conformist.

Work values associated with level of education. Level of education was coded to three categories. These were holders of bachelor's degrees, master's degrees and doctorates. The four faculty with advanced graduate specialist certificates were included with master's degrees for the purpose of analysis. The three categories of educational status were crosstabulated with the six values systems in high and low categories.

Results of the chi square measure of association are summarized in Table 16.

Table 13. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests Between Sex and Values System, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

EXISTENTIAL Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Male	73	90	163
Female	49	23	72
Total Column	122	113	235

$X^2 = 9.921$
Significance = .0016
1 Degree of Freedom

SOCIOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Male	76	87	163
Female	46	26	72
Total Column	122	113	235

$X^2 = 5.290$
Significance = .021
1 Degree of Freedom

MANIPULATIVE Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Male	90	73	163
Female	28	44	72
Total Column	118	117	235

$X^2 = 4.691$
Significance = .030
1 Degree of Freedom

CONFORMIST Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Male	90	73	163
Female	27	45	72
Total Column	117	118	235

$X^2 = 5.580$
Significance = .18
1 Degree of Freedom

TRIBALISTIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Male	98	65	163
Female	22	50	72
Total Column	120	115	235

$X^2 = 16.308$
Significance = .0001
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 14. Chi Square Measures of Association Between Age of Respondents and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Faculty, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	8.203	.084
Sociocentric	8.833	.065
Manipulative	1.073	.898
Conformist	17.160	.0018**
Egocentric	4.706	.319
Tribalistic	0.765	.943

**Significant at .01 level
N = 235
Missing Cases = 27
4 Degrees of Freedom

Table 15. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association-Conformist Value System by Age, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

CONFORMIST Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Under 30 years	15	36	51
Compared to Rest	102	82	184
Total Column	117	118	235
X^2 = 9.861 Significance = .0022 1 Degree of Freedom			
40 to 49 years	40	22	62
Compared to Rest	77	96	173
Total Column	117	118	235
X^2 = 6.530 Significance = .010 1 Degree of Freedom			

Table 16. Chi Square Test of Association Between Educational Level and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	1.305	.521
Sociocentric	9.027	.011*
Manipulative	1.673	.433
Conformist	6.951	.031*
Egocentric	1.745	.418
Tribalistic	3.162	.206

*Significant at .05 level
N = 235
Missing Cases = 27
2 Degrees of Freedom

Significant association was found between educational level and the sociocentric values system and the conformist values system. No significant differences were found in the existential, manipulative, egocentric and tribalistic values systems. Results of the chi square contingency tests are found in Table 17. Bachelor's degree holders were significantly higher in the sociocentric values system. Doctorate degree holders were significantly lower in sociocentrism.

Bachelor's degree holders were significantly lower in the conformist values system.

Work values associated with hours of formal coursework in behavioral science. Hours of formal behavioral science coursework by respondents were recoded to 0-29 hours and 30 hours or more. The two classifications, 0-9 and 30 or more semester hours, were crosstabulated with the six values systems.

Significance was found in the existential and manipulative values systems. No significant differences were found in the sociocentric, conformist, egocentric and tribalistic values systems. Results are summarized in Table 18. Table 19 shows significant chi square contingency tests.

Those faculty with less than 30 hours of formal behavioral science coursework were significantly more centered in the manipulative values system than those with 30 or more hours. Those with more than 30 hours were significantly more centered in the existential values system.

Table 17. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Educational Level and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

SOCIOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Bachelor's degree	51	32	83
Compared to Rest	71	81	152
Total Column	122	113	235

$X^2 = 4.098$
Significance = .041
1 Degree of Freedom

SOCIOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Doctorate degree	24	41	65
Compared to Rest	98	72	170
Total Column	122	113	235

$X^2 = 7.281$
Significance = .0071
1 Degree of Freedom

CONFORMIST Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Bachelor's degree	33	50	83
Compared to Rest	84	68	152
Total Column	117	118	235

$X^2 = 6.951$
Significance = .031
1 Degree of Freedom

Among faculty with a doctorate degree, significance was found in behavioral science hours associated with the manipulative values system as shown in Table 20.

As can be seen in Table 21, those faculty holding a doctorate degree with 0-29 hours of behavioral science coursework were significantly more manipulative in value orientation than those with 30 hours or more.

Based on the results of Tables 6 through 21, it was concluded that there were significant differences in the association of the six values of working orientation among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty.

Table 18. Chi Square Test of Association Between Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	7.841	.005**
Sociocentric	3.361	.067
Manipulative	8.505	.0035**
Conformist	0.009	.924
Egocentric	0.240	.624
Tribalistic	1.143	.285

**Significant at .01 level
N = 209
Missing Cases = 53
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 19. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

EXISTENTIAL	FREQUENCIES		
Comparison	High	Low	Total Row
0-29 Hours	62	75	137
30 Hours and over	48	24	72
Total Column	110	99	209

X^2 = 7.841
Significance = .0051
1 Degree of Freedom

MANIPULATIVE			
Comparison	High	Low	Total Row
0-29 Hours	80	57	137
30 Hours and over	26	46	72
Total Column	106	103	209

X^2 = 8.505
Significance = .0035
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 20. Chi Square Test of Association Between Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty with Doctorate, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	0.680	.410
Sociocentric	0.757	.384
Manipulative	3.904	.048*
Conformist	0.009	.924
Egocentric	1.730	.188
Tribalistic	0.00002	.9961

*Significant at .05 level
N = 59
Missing Cases = 12
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 21. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests - Hours of Behavioral Science Courses and Manipulative Work Values, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty with Doctorate, 1976

MANIPULATIVE Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
0-29 Hours	26	16	42
30 Hours and over	5	12	17
Total Column	31	28	59

X^2 = 3.904
Significance = .048
1 Degree of Freedom

The results are summarized and discussed in Chapter 5.

Question 2: Are there differences in job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

Analysis of job satisfaction was conducted under the premise that no Extension workers are actually dissatisfied, but there are more satisfied and less satisfied workers. The dissatisfied workers generally separate from the service at an early time.

Scoring. The Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory was scored according to a Likert-type scale of:

4 = very satisfied
3 = satisfied
2 = dissatisfied
1 = very dissatisfied

Missing values were supplied with the median score of 2.5 if three or fewer items were missing.

Responses to the Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory (adapted from Calloway's inventory) were factor analyzed to minimize intercorrelations of the items. Items retained after the factor analysis procedure were summated by factor to provide a score for each factor. In addition, the items loading in all the factors were added to provide a score representing the total of the items or a total job satisfaction score.

Missing values were supplied for those job satisfaction questionnaire items in which three or fewer responses were missing per questionnaire. The median score for scale values (2.5) was supplied.

Useable questionnaire numbers were increased from 204 to 249 by this procedure. Of this number, 226 questionnaires were useable for both the work values and job satisfaction analyses.

These scores were divided at the 50th percentile to create high and low groups for further analysis by the chi square test of association in crosstabulations by demographic data.

The factor analysis results are summarized below.

Factor Analysis of Job Satisfaction Items

The Calloway 45-item inventory of job satisfaction was logically written to include nine of Herzberg's dimensions of job satisfaction. These dimensions were the motivatory dimensions of achievement, recognition, the work itself, advancement, responsibility and the hygiene dimensions of organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary and working conditions.

Two items, 46 and 47, were added to the questionnaire. These were logically written to be included in the Herzberg dimension of organizational policy and administration. These items were:

46. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in reporting your accomplishments.

47. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in evaluating your accomplishments.

Means and standard deviations of the 47 items before analysis are shown in Table 22.

The 47-item inventory was factor analyzed by the SPSS program, "FACTOR" subprogram. Twelve factors were found with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. The factors were examined for loading higher than .40 and the eigenvalues of the factor matrix of 47 items were plotted. Examination of the graph indicated a possible eight factors.

The 47 items were again factored with eight factors specified and rotated with the varimax procedure.

The rotated factor matrix is reproduced in Table 23. Items loading .40 or higher were retained and summated for the total job satisfaction raw score for each case.

Table 24 shows the means, standard deviation and factor loading of the 33 items retained from the rotation of eight factors.

An examination of the items with highest rotated factor loadings on each factor indicated the appropriate name of the factor: 1) achievement, 2) supervision, 3) salary, 4) reporting, 5) responsibility, 6) advancement, 7) recognition and 8) working conditions.

The items loading on each factor are listed below.

Factor 1, Achievement

1. The actual adoption of recommended practices by people you work with in the county (or state).

15. Working with and through local leaders (or agents) to get your job done.

24. The extent to which the goals in your county (or department) plan of work are usually achieved.

25. The opportunity for responsibility in helping plan the total county (or state) Extension program.

31. The way local people support the Extension program.

38. The extent to which people in the county (or agents) actually help in planning and carrying out your part of the total program.

Table 22. Means and Standard Deviations of Job Satisfaction Items Before Factor Analysis of Inventory, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Item	Valid Observations	Means	Standard Deviation
1	260	2.948	.570
2	261	2.987	.605
3	262	2.710	.853
4	262	3.424	.643
5	261	2.556	.776
6	261	2.762	.853
7	261	2.810	.588
8	262	3.511	.552
9	261	2.542	.856
10	260	2.860	.712
11	261	2.573	.825
12	261	2.412	.782
13	260	2.685	.857
14	257	2.035	.784
15	260	3.077	.578
16	258	2.911	.620
17	260	1.894	.774
18	258	2.326	.874
19	257	2.992	.504
20	259	2.909	.632
21	257	2.440	.762
22	261	3.406	.611
23	258	2.733	.755
24	256	2.762	.615
25	258	2.647	.775
26	260	1.982	.818
27	260	2.850	.684
28	261	2.743	.696
29	257	2.681	.770
30	259	2.349	.733
31	259	2.909	.667
32	259	2.954	.555
33	259	2.579	.795
34	260	2.837	.632
35	258	2.855	.611
36	259	2.656	.779
37	258	2.109	.773
38	259	2.834	.613
39	259	2.602	.757
40	260	2.458	.703
41	258	2.835	.640
42	257	2.628	.760
43	259	2.670	.809
44	261	3.165	.618
45	260	3.104	.708
46	260	2.283	.802
47	259	2.116	.776

Table 23. Summary of Rotated Factor Loadings for Factor Analysis of 47 Items in Eight Factors of Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Item	Rotated Factor Loadings								Communalities
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1	487	100	-023	034	052	111	075	074	275
2	352	112	029	115	231	-049	-031	126	223
3	117	708	090	079	024	041	-006	084	539
4	155	059	-020	-011	306	-033	276	029	200
5	072	039	196	048	-019	047	163	648	498
6	-006	031	271	099	287	191	058	193	243
7	103	152	138	024	212	125	118	264	198
8	367	106	119	-021	189	087	139	175	226
9	201	398	141	132	040	231	102	233	356
10	056	351	105	099	145	212	552	069	523
11	388	513	042	019	048	096	038	-083	436
12	252	321	209	190	092	007	286	026	337
13	095	755	018	041	064	032	091	102	605
14	004	126	601	067	075	237	043	-021	446
15	538	113	007	055	236	-023	091	-024	371
16	108	153	059	033	162	056	549	197	410
17	069	066	757	086	-001	150	034	186	647
18	085	549	203	223	033	184	178	087	474
19	401	079	062	-065	288	-034	408	103	436
20	249	172	041	038	230	499	087	-090	412
21	093	353	119	150	157	384	353	-197	505
22	266	108	071	007	440	022	217	-069	334
23	060	517	161	001	228	212	291	085	486
24	515	251	015	-014	212	099	038	006	385
25	410	173	012	090	116	339	175	-109	377
26	030	066	783	046	108	219	089	157	713
27	171	610	-015	-047	207	139	147	-084	495
28	329	308	141	109	214	091	201	063	334
29	078	114	118	095	131	364	083	059	202
30	079	185	253	027	008	685	076	138	600
31	529	-007	103	053	085	047	194	134	358
32	370	033	079	037	085	033	361	232	338
33	155	458	092	176	085	239	191	-024	374
34	240	333	034	-092	100	255	340	002	369
35	235	343	059	136	092	329	441	022	506
36	095	769	013	078	024	172	150	156	683
37	-015	282	477	166	001	400	028	030	496
38	531	114	-061	048	028	105	019	034	314
39	148	135	041	014	095	126	027	672	519
40	066	159	221	013	017	801	098	200	770
41	144	181	-006	035	080	362	554	044	502
42	009	073	323	020	076	637	093	137	550
43	093	-075	156	-007	394	153	073	245	283
44	231	201	030	134	689	130	083	058	615
45	282	179	-028	155	507	120	174	-035	440
46	107	136	089	890	117	110	034	017	857
47	131	207	194	796	094	094	076	076	761

Item numbers correspond with part 3 of the questionnaire reproduced in Appendix I. Decimals have been omitted in the Table.

Factor 2, Supervision

3. The competency of your supervisors (or department chairman) to give you meaningful assistance in your work.

9. The adequacy of on-the-job training in helping you understand your job responsibilities.

11. The manner in which the staff is encouraged to work together.

13. The on-the-job supervision given you by your immediate supervisor (or department chairman).

18. The evaluation process which your supervisors (or department chairman) use to judge your effectiveness as an Extension worker.

23. The extent to which your supervisors (or department chairman) acknowledge your outstanding performances.

27. The willingness of your immediate supervisor (or department chairman) to delegate responsibility.

33. The extent to which you are informed by your supervisors about Extension matters affecting you.

36. The counsel and guidance you get from your supervisors (or department chairman).

Factor 3, Salary

14. The range in salaries paid Extension workers in your county (or department).

17. The salary available to Extension workers as compared to similar people in private industry.

26. The salary you get as compared to the salaries people with similar training get in other professions.

Factor 4, Reporting

46. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in reporting your accomplishments.

47. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in evaluating your accomplishments.

Factor 5, Responsibility

22. The latitude to exercise your own initiative in your position.

44. The amount of responsibility you have in your work.

45. The authority you have to get your job done.

Factor 6, Advancement

20. The opportunities provided for increased responsibility in Extension.

30. The opportunities for advancement in Extension as compared with those in private industry.

40. Your opportunities for advancement in Extension.

42. Your advancement since you have been employed by Extension.

Factor 7, Recognition

10. The amount of recognition you receive as compared to your co-workers.

16. The number of organized groups you are responsible for as compared with your co-workers.

35. The recognition you get for your ideas and suggestions from the county staff (or departmental staff).

41. The recognition given you by your co-workers for outstanding accomplishments in your county (or department).

Factor 8, Working Conditions

5. The number of hours required each week in your job as compared to those in similar positions in other professions.

39. The number of night meetings required in your work.

The items loading on each factor were summated to provide raw scores for that factor. These factor scores were then utilized for further analysis. The frequency distributions of these scores were divided at the 50th percentile to create high and low factor groups.

One item which was logically written by Calloway to measure the work itself, was subsequently moved by her to achievement. The same

finding was noted in this study.

This was:

15. Working with and through local leaders (or agents) to get your job done.

Also, one item written by Calloway to measure working conditions loaded on achievement in this study.

This was:

31. The way local people support the Extension program.

In addition, one item written by Calloway to measure responsibility loaded on achievement in this study.

This was:

25. The opportunity for responsibility in helping plan the total county (or state) Extension program.

Three items written by Calloway to measure organizational policy and administration loaded on supervision in this study. These items were:

9. The adequacy of on-the-job training in helping you understand your job responsibilities.

11. The manner in which the staff is encouraged to work together.

33. The extent to which you are informed by your supervisors about Extension matters affecting you.

One item written by Calloway to measure recognition loaded on supervision in this study.

This was:

23. The extent to which your supervisors (or department chairman) acknowledge your outstanding performance.

Two items written by this author to measure the reporting function of organizational policy and administration loaded together to form a factor not previously identified as a job satisfaction factor by Herzberg or Calloway.

The items were:

46. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in reporting your accomplishments.

47. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in evaluating your accomplishments.

The factor was identified as reporting and kept as a factor in further analysis.

One item written by Calloway to measure the work itself loaded on the factor responsibility. This was:

22. The lattitude to exercise your own initiative in your position.

Also, an item written by Calloway to measure responsibility loaded on the factor recognition. This was:

16. The number of organized groups you are responsible for as compared with your co-workers.

Items 9, 16, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26, and 27 were not kept as items in Calloway's refined instrument, but loaded at .40 and were kept in this study.

Four items kept as items in Calloway's refined instrument were not retained in this study. These were:

12. The degree to which Extension's policies are clear-cut enough to serve as guides for you in doing your work.

21. The way you are involved in making policy decisions.

37. The method used in arriving at your salary.

43. The amount of time which is available to you for your personal professional growth.

Item 6 of Calloway's original inventory was not used in the study as not fitting Maryland Extension conditions. This was:

6. The different salaries paid Extension workers with similar experiences depending on the county where employed.

Maryland Extension county faculty are salaried according to a professional rank system not based on a salary structure for each individual county. Instead, the following item concerning benefits was written by the author for the salary factor:

6. The fringe benefits other than salary in Extension as compared to private industry.

Item 6 as rewritten did not load at .40 in this study and was not retained as an item in the refined instrument.

Two items, 19 and 37, loaded at .40 on two separate factors each. Item 19 loaded at .40 on the achievement factor and .41 on the recognition factor. Item 37 loaded at .48 on the salary factor and .40 on the advancement factor. The items were:

19. The number of organized groups for which you are directly responsible.

37. The method used in arriving at your salary.

The author recognizes that alternative methods of handling such a situation exist. The items could have been retained and added into the factor-derived score for each factor on which the items loaded in order to maximize predictive validity.

The author chose not to retain the items because of their factoral complexity to minimize intercorrelation of tests. The goal was to refine the inventory.

Other items not retained in the inventory not loading at .40 on either factor were:

2. The immediate results you see from your work.

4. The informal setting of Extension work.

6. The fringe benefits other than salary in Extension as compared to private industry.

7. The extent to which you are expected to accept responsibilities for activities outside of your major area of interest.

8. The type of work you do.

Reliability of the Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory. In this study the coefficient of internal consistency was obtained by calculating for each of the above factors the relationship between the variance of the individual items and the total variance of the factor. The coefficient of reliability was determined using the Kuder-Richardson formula 20.

Kuder-Richardson coefficients of reliability are shown in Table 24.

Job satisfaction associated with job assignment. The six groups of job assignments, 4-H agents, agriculture science agents, home economics agents, community and resource development agents, state specialists and the administrative-supervisory group were cross-tabulated with the six values systems.

Table 24. Internal Consistency of Job Satisfaction Factors from Factor Analysis of Job Satisfaction Inventory, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Factor and Items[a]	Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading[b]	Reliability[c]
Achievement				
1	2.948	.570	487	
15	3.077	.579	538	
24	2.762	.615	515	
25	2.647	.775	410	
31	2.909	.667	529	
38	2.834	.613	531	.713
Supervision				
3	2.710	.853	708	
9	2.542	.856	398	
11	2.573	.825	513	
13	2.685	.857	755	
18	2.326	.874	549	
23	2.733	.755	517	
27	2.850	.684	610	
33	2.579	.795	458	
36	2.656	.779	768	.832
Salary				
14	2.035	.784	601	
17	1.894	.774	757	
26	1.983	.818	783	.806
Reporting				
46	2.283	.802	890	
47	2.116	.776	796	.892
Responsibility				
22	3.406	.611	440	
44	3.165	.618	689	
45	3.104	.708	507	.707
Advancement				
20	2.909	.632	450	
30	2.349	.733	685	
40	2.458	.703	801	
42	2.628	.760	637	.803
Recognition				
10	2.860	.712	552	
16	2.911	.620	549	
35	2.855	.611	441	
41	2.835	.640	554	.760
Working Conditions				
5	2.556	.776	648	
39	2.602	.757	672	.698

a. Item numbers correspond to key on pages 35-43.
b. Factor loadings rounded to three digits and decimal removed.
c. Reliability is a Kuder-Richardson formula 20 estimate.

Significance was found in the job satisfaction association with job assignment. The raw chi square of this comparison was 17.684 with a significance of .0034 with five degrees of freedom.

Significance results of the chi square contingency tests of association are found in Table 25.

The administrative-supervisory group was found to exhibit significantly higher job satisfaction than the rest of the faculty. 4-H agents were significantly less satisfied than the rest of the faculty.

All groups were significantly less satisfied than the administrative-supervisory group. Less than five were expected in a cell of the chi square contingency test of community and resource development agents compared with the administrative group. Even though the significance of the test was .0041, results should be considered invalid because of an insufficient number.

Job satisfaction factors associated with job assignment. The eight factors identified from the factor analysis of job satisfaction responses were crosstabulated in high and low categories with job assignment. The eight factors were achievement, supervison, salary, reporting, responsibility, advancement, recognition and working conditions.

Significance was found in the following factors: achievement, supervision, advancement, recognition and working conditions. No significance was found in the factors of salary, reporting and responsibility. Table 26 summarizes the association between job assignment and job satisfaction factors.

Significant results of the chi square contingency tests are found in Table 27.

Agriculture science agents were significantly more satisfied with the achievement factor than the rest of the faculty. Home economics agents were significantly less satisfied with the supervision factor than the rest of the faculty. Specialists and the administrative-supervisory group were significantly more satisfied with the supervision factor than the rest.

The administrative-supervisory group was significantly more satisfied with the factors of advancement, recognition, supervision and working conditions than the rest of the faculty. 4-H agents were significantly less satisfied with the factors of recognition and working conditions than the rest of the faculty. Community and resource development agents were significantly more satisfied with working conditions than the rest. However, an expected frequency in a cell was found to be less than five. This test should be disregarded because of an insufficient number.

Table 25. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association of Job Assignment With Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

JOB SATISFACTION Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
4-H Agents	17	30	47
to Rest	110	92	202
Total Column	127	122	249
$X^2 = 4.396$ Significance = .034 1 Degree of Freedom			
Administrative	20	4	24
to Rest	107	118	225
Total Column	127	122	249
$X^2 = 9.723$ Significance = .0023 1 Degree of Freedom			
4-H Agents	17	30	47
to Administrative	20	4	24
Total Column	37	34	71
$X^2 = 12.334$ Significance = .00079 1 Degree of Freedom			
Agriculture Agents	19	20	39
to Administrative	20	4	24
Total Column	39	24	63
$X^2 = 6.152$ Significance = .013 1 Degree of Freedom			
Home Economics Agents	20	20	40
to Administrative	20	4	24
Total Column	40	24	64
$X^2 = 5.760$ Significance = .016 1 Degree of Freedom			
Community and Resource Development Agents	2	7	9
to Administrative	20	4	24
Total Column	22	11	33
$X^2 = 8.422$ Significance = .0041 Less than 5 expected in cell 1 Degree of Freedom			
State Specialist	49	41	90
to Administrative	20	4	24
Total Column	69	45	114
$X^2 = 5.465$ Significance = .018 1 Degree of Freedom			

Table 26. Chi Square Test of Association Between Job Assignment and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Factor	Chi Square	Significance
Achievement	15.722	.0077**
Supervision	21.496	.0007***
Salary	2.766	.736
Reporting	3.701	.593
Responsibility	4.736	.449
Advancement	16.747	.0050**
Recognition	12.928	.0241*
Working Conditions	42.143	.0000****

5 Degrees of Freedom
*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level
***Significant at .001 level
****Significant at .0001 level

Job satisfaction association with demographic data. The subjects in high and low job satisfaction groups were crosstabulated with the following demographic classifications: county chairperson and non-chairperson county faculty, years of experience, sex, age, educational level and semester hours of behavioral science formal coursework.

Significance was found in the association of age to job satisfaction. No significance was found in county chairperson compared to non-chairperson county faculty, years of experience, educational level or semester hours of behavioral science coursework.

Table 28 summarizes the association of job satisfaction among selected demographic groups.

Significant contingency tests of association are shown in Table 29.

Those faculty in the age group of 30 to 39 were significantly less satisfied with the job than the rest of the faculty. The age group of 60 years or older were significantly more satisfied than the rest of the faculty.

Based on the data, it is concluded that there are significant differences in job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty.

Table 27. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association Between Job Assignment and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

ACHIEVEMENT		FREQUENCIES	
Comparison	High	Low	Total Row
Agriculture Agents	35	4	39
to Rest	136	76	212
Total Column	171	80	251

$X^2 = 8.792$
Significance = .0034
1 Degree of Freedom

SUPERVISION		FREQUENCIES	
Comparison	High	Low	Total Row
Home Economics Agents	15	26	41
to Rest	115	97	212
Total Column	130	123	253

$X^2 = 3.611$
Significance = .054
1 Degree of Freedom

SUPERVISION		FREQUENCIES	
Comparison	High	Low	Total Row
Specialists	56	35	91
to Rest	74	88	162
Total Column	130	123	253

$X^2 = 5.249$
Significance = .021
1 Degree of Freedom

SUPERVISION		FREQUENCIES	
Comparison	High	Low	Total Row
Administrative-Supervisory	19	5	24
to Rest	111	118	229
Total Column	130	123	253

$X^2 = 7.011$
Significance = .0082
1 Degree of Freedom

ADVANCEMENT		FREQUENCIES	
Comparison	High	Low	Total Row
Administrative-Supervisory	21	4	25
to Rest	116	112	228
Total Column	137	116	253

$X^2 = 8.666$
Significance = .0037
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 27. (Continued)

RECOGNITION Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
4-H Agents	22	25	47
to Rest	137	68	205
Total Column	159	93	252

$X^2 = 5.750$
Significance = .016
1 Degree of Freedom

RECOGNITION Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Administrative-Supervisory	22	3	25
to Rest	137	90	227
Total Column	159	93	252

$X^2 = 6.253$
Significance = .012
1 Degree of Freedom

WORKING CONDITIONS Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
4-H Agents	8	43	51
to Rest	127	81	208
Total Column	135	124	259

$X^2 = 31.993$
Significance = .000005
1 Degree of Freedom

WORKING CONDITIONS Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Community and Resource Development Agents	9	1	10
to Rest	126	123	249
Total Column	135	124	259

$X^2 = 4.505$
Significance = .032
1 Degree of Freedom
Less than 5 expected in cell

WORKING CONDITIONS Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
Administrative-Supervisory	20	5	25
to Rest	115	119	234
Total Column	135	124	259

$X^2 = 7.425$
Significance = .0066
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 28. Chi Square Test of Association Between Demographic Data and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Demographics	Chi Square	Significance	D.F.
Chairperson	.678	.410	1
Years of Experience	5.457	.244	4
Sex	.578	.447	1
Age	20.330	.0004***	4
Educational Level	.351	.839	2
Hours of Behavioral Science	.821	.365	1
Hours of Behavioral Science among Holders of Doctorate	.291	.590	1

***Significant at .001 level

Table 29. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association of Age and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

AGE Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
30-39 years	19	40	59
to Rest	108	82	190
Total Column	127	122	249
$X^2 = 9.973$ Significance = .002 1 Degree of Freedom			
60 years or older	13	3	16
to Rest	114	119	233
Total Column	127	122	249
$X^2 = 5.031$ Significance = .024 1 Degree of Freedom			

The results are summarized and discussed in Chapter 5.

Question 3: Is there a relationship between work values and job satisfaction among faculty of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service?

Subjects in high and low classifications of job satisfaction were crosstabulated with the six values systems in high and low classifications.

Significance was found in the egocentric values system in association with job satisfaction. No significance was found in the existential, sociocentric, manipulative, conformist or tribalistic values systems. Table 30 summarizes the association of the six values systems with job satisfaction. The significant contingency test is shown in Table 31.

Faculty who were more egocentric were significantly lower in job satisfaction.

Table 30. Chi Square Test of Association Between Values Systems and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Work Values	Chi Square	Significance
Existential	1.403	.236
Sociocentric	1.713	.191
Manipulative	.287	.592
Conformist	.018	.894
Egocentric	5.332	.021*
Tribalistic	.014	.905

*Significant at the .05 level
1 Degree of Freedom

Job Satisfaction Factors Associated With Values of Working

The eight factors identified from the factor analysis of job satisfaction responses were crosstabulated in high and low categories with each of the eight values systems. The eight factors were achievement, supervision, salary, reporting, responsibility, advancement, recognition and working conditions. Table 32 summarizes the associa-

tion found in the crosstabulations.

Significance was found in the sociocentric association with salary, conformist association with achievement, and egocentric association with supervision and recognition. Significant results of the chi square contingency tests are found in Table 33.

Table 31. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association Between the Egocentric Value System and Job Satisfaction, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

EGOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
High Job Satisfaction	64	52	116
Low Job Satisfaction	78	32	110
Total Column	142	84	226

$X^2 = 5.332$
Significance = .021
1 Degree of Freedom

Those faculty high in sociocentrism were significantly higher in satisfaction with the salary factor. Those faculty high in the conformist value system were significantly higher in satisfaction with the achievement factor. Those faculty higher in egocentrism were significantly lower in satisfaction with both the supervision factor and the recognition factor.

Based on the data, it is concluded that there is a relationship between work values and job satisfaction among faculty of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service. The results are summarized and discussed in Chapter 5.

Table 32. Chi Square Test of Association Between Values Systems and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

Value System		JOB SATISFACTION FACTOR Achievement	Supervision	Salary	Reporting	Responsibility	Advancement	Recognition	Working Conditions
Existential	X^2	1.616	.201	.516	.101	.001	.635	.522	1.800
	Sig	.204	.654	.472	.750	.984	.426	.470	.180
Sociocentric	X^2	.021	.240	10.272	.217	2.723	3.022	.134	.141
	Sig	.885	.624	.0014**	.641	.099	.082	.714	.708
Manipulative	X^2	.455	.040	1.248	1.213	2.760	.047	.364	.978
	Sig	.500	.841	.264	.271	.097	.828	.546	.323
Conformist	X^2	7.217	.004	1.1[illegible]0	.017	1.640	.005	.107	.004
	Sig	.0072**	.949	.282	.898	.200	.942	.744	.951
Egocentric	X^2	.174	4.442	1.992	2.347	.288	1.560	5.025	.356
	Sig	.676	.035*	.158	.126	.591	.212	.025*	.550
Tribalistic	X^2	.102	2.272	1.820	.413	.217	2.029	.582	.385
	Sig	.749	.132	.177	.521	.641	.154	.446	.535

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level
1 Degree of Freedom

Table 33. Significant Chi Square Contingency Tests of Association Between Values of Working and Job Satisfaction Factors, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976

SOCIOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
High Salary Satisfaction	87	55	142
Low Salary Satisfaction	34	54	88
Total Column	121	109	230

$X^2 = 10.272$
Significance = .0014
1 Degree of Freedom

CONFORMIST Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
High Achievement Satisfaction	88	69	157
Low Achievement Satisfaction	25	45	70
Total Column	113	114	227

$X^2 = 7.217$
Significance = .0072
1 Degree of Freedom

EGOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
High Supervision Satisfaction	66	52	118
Low Supervision Satisfaction	78	33	111
Total Column	144	85	229

$X^2 = 4.442$
Significance = .035
1 Degree of Freedom

EGOCENTRIC Comparison	FREQUENCIES High	Low	Total Row
High Recognition Satisfaction	83	63	146
Low Recognition Satisfaction	59	22	81
Total Column	142	85	227

$X^2 = 5.025$
Significance = .025
1 Degree of Freedom

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the research and implications of the results.

Summary

This study dealt with the values of Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty toward work, and possible relationships associated with job satisfaction. The major objective of the study was to determine the work values held by the subjects. Other objectives were to provide a benchmark study and a data base for future job satisfaction studies and future management studies.

The 272 faculty were surveyed; of that number, 262 responses were received.

The instruments used were the Values For Working, copyrighted instrument by Hughes and Flowers, and the Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory, adapted from the County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory by Calloway.

Data were analyzed using the chi square test of association in crosstabulation tables with a level of significance set at .05 or less. The job satisfaction inventory was factor analyzed to minimize intercorrelation of items. The job satisfaction inventory was written to include nine of Herzbergs' dimensions of job satisfaction. These were achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, the work itself, organizational policy and administration, working conditions, supervision and salary.

The study was exploratory; no hypotheses were presented. Three questions were asked before analysis:

1. Are there differences of values systems orientations among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

2. Are there differences in job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

3. Is there a relationship between values systems and job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

Conclusions

Analysis revealed differences in value system orientation and level of job satisfaction among Maryland Extension faculty, and a relationship between work values and job satisfaction.

Factor analysis of job satisfaction indicated eight factors contributing to variance in job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty. The factors were: achievement, supervision, salary, reporting, responsibility, advancement, recognition and working conditions. The work itself and organizational policy and administration were not identified as separate factors.

Two items written to measure the reporting function of organizational policy and administration loaded together to form a factor not previously identified as a job satisfaction factor by Herzberg or Calloway.

The items were:

46. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in reporting your accomplishments.

47. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in evaluating your accomplishments.

The factor was identified as reporting and kept as a factor in further analysis.

The results of the factor analysis support the construct validity of the instrument as a measure of job satisfaction among Extension faculty based on Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory.

Work values of the Maryland Extension faculty were found to be highest in the existential value orientation with a mean of 30.92; followed by sociocentric, 20.02; manipulative, 15.83; conformist, 15.71; tribalistic, 10.24; and egocentric, 3.30.

Results should be interpreted and discussed with the means for the values systems in mind. The Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty were found to be predominantly centered in the existential and sociocentric values systems.

The administrative-supervisory group were significantly less egocentric than the rest of the faculty and significantly higher in job satisfaction. All other groups of job assignment were significantly lower in satisfaction with the job than the administrative work group. A significant relationship was found in the egocentric values system. Those faculty in the highly egocentric group were significantly less satisfied with the job and with the Herzberg factors of supervision and recognition. Conversely, the administrative group, low in egocentrism, was significantly more satisfied with recognition, supervision, advancement and working conditions than the rest of the faculty.

The 10 community and resource development agents were all in the high group of egocentrism. Seven of the 10 were also found in the low group of job satisfaction. An expected frequency of less than five was found in both comparisons invalidating the chi square statistic; however, a relationship appeared to exist.

As policymakers, the administrative-supervisory group would be expected to be higher in job satisfaction than those of the faculty to whom the policy is directed. Having advanced within the organization, and being responsible for supervision, the administrative-supervisory group would be expected to be higher in those factors as well.

The data suggest that the egocentric values system was highly related to job satisfaction in the Maryland Extension faculty.

4-H agents were significantly higher in egocentrism as compared to the administrative-supervisory group but not to the rest of the faculty. They were significantly less satisfied with the job and Herzberg factors, working conditions and recognition, than the rest of the faculty. The data again suggest a relationship between egocentrism and job satisfaction.

4-H agents were more sociocentric than the rest of the faculty with the exception of home economics agents and the administrative-supervisory group. The data showed no significant relationship between sociocentrism and job satisfaction. A significant relationship was found between sociocentrism and the salary factor. Those higher in sociocentrism were significantly more satisfied with the salary. Hughes and Flowers' research indicates that sociocentrics seek fulfilling personal interrelationships with others more actively than salary or advancement in the organization. No clear conclusion could be drawn from the data.

Hughes and Flowers' research indicates that differences (disparity) in values system orientation between management and employees will lead to lower job satisfaction. The data suggest there was little disparity of values in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service, with the possible exception that 4-H agents were significantly higher and the administrative-supervisory staff significantly lower in egocentrism.

In an attempt to identify the management level operating, a panel of nine experts was identified as knowledgeable of Maryland Extension management.

An instrument was prepared containing six paragraphs describing what management of the Maryland Cooperative Extension would be for each of the six values levels. These paragraphs were written from questionnaires used by Hughes and Flowers in other research.

The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix II. Paragraphs corresponded to the values system as follows: A) tribalistic, B) egocentric, C) conformist, D) manipulative, E) sociocentric, F) existential.

Responses by the nine member panel of experts were tabulated. Results were as follows:

Existential	5
Sociocentric	2
Manipulative	1
Conformist	0
Egocentric	1
Tribalistic	0

Based on the data and agreement by the panel of experts, it was concluded that management in Maryland Extension was predominantly at the existential level.

Hughes and Flowers' research indicates disparity would exist between highly existential or sociocentric managers and highly egocentric and tribalistic employees. The data support this position. County chairpersons were significantly higher in the conformist value system than non-chairperson county faculty. No significant difference in job satisfaction was found.

No significant difference in value system orientation or job satisfaction was found among agriculture science agents. Agriculture science agents were significantly more satisfied with the Herzberg achievement factor than the rest of the faculty.

Home economics agents were significantly less satisfied with the supervision factor, but not with the job. No significant differences in work values systems were found in home economics agents compared to the rest of the faculty.

Sex differences were more apparent, however. Females were significantly more existential and sociocentric than males. Males were significantly more conformist, manipulative and tribalistic. No significant difference was found in job satisfaction between sexes.

No significant differences in values systems were found operating in the specialists. No significant difference in job satisfaction was found in specialists as compared to the rest of the faculty. Specialists were significantly more satisfied with the supervision factor than the rest of the faculty.

Significant differences in work values but not job satisfaction were found when educational level was analyzed. Those faculty with bachelor's degrees only were more sociocentric and less conformist. Those faculty with doctorates were significantly lower in sociocentrism. No significant differences were found among master's degree holders.

There was a significant difference in values system orientation between those faculty with 29 or fewer semester hours of behavioral science formal coursework as compared to those with 30 or more. Those faculty with less behavioral science training were more manipulative. Those with more behavioral science training were more existential. Behavioral science training would be expected to relate more to sociocentrism than to existentialism.

The relationship of values systems to behavioral science training among doctorate holders was analyzed. Doctorate holders with less than 30 hours of behavioral science training were significantly higher in the manipulative values system. Hughes and Flowers' research indicates a tendency for technically-oriented scientists to be more centered in the manipulative values system. The data support this finding. No significant differences in job satisfaction were found associated with behavioral science training.

Significant differences in values system orientation were found in two age groups. Those faculty less than 30 years of age were significantly less conformist, and those 40-49 years of age were significantly more conformist. The data agrees with that of the work values cross-tabulation with years of Extension experience. Those faculty with 2-5 years of Extension experience were significantly less conformist. Those with 11-15 and 16 or more years of experience were significantly more conformist.

The data suggest that faculty become more conformist the longer they stay with the organization. Some of the less conformist faculty may have left the organization at an earlier time.

No significant difference in job satisfaction was found in analysis of years of Extension experience. Significant differences in job satisfaction were found in two age groups, however. Those faculty

30-39 years of age were significantly less satisfied, and those 60 years or older were significantly more satisfied than the rest of the faculty. The data suggest that faculty tended to become more conformist with increasing age and also to have higher job satisfaction.

This suggestion was further supported when faculty with high and low conformist values were crosstabulated with the Herzberg factors of job satisfaction. Those faculty higher in the conformist value system were significantly more satisfied with the achievement factor. No significant association was found among the conformist work value system and other Herzberg factors, or satisfaction with the job.

In summary, the data indicate there were significant differences in values system orientation and level of job satisfaction among Maryland Extension faculty. A significant relationship exists between the egocentric values system and job satisfaction.

The data appear to support the research of Hughes and Flowers that disparity of value systems would decrease job satisfaction.

Implications

The following general implications are made based on the reported research:

1. Work values need to be recognized as a possible source of dissatisfaction in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service.

2. Consideration should be given to having administrative-supervisory faculty participate in training programs to help them understand the problems of potential disparity of values systems. Management should be prepared to adapt organizational goals to people with values systems different from their own.

3. Primary sources of dissatisfaction among various job assignments appear to be related to supervision in home economics agents, and working conditions and recognition in 4-H and youth agents. Salary and reporting appear to be common dissatisfying factors. The dissatisfying factors need to be recognized and attenuated where possible.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the review of literature and the research reported, the following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. That further research concerning work values and job satisfaction be conducted with a larger number of administrative staff, supervisory staff and department heads and with a stratified sample of Extension managers and employees in selected demographic classifications from the state Extension population.

2. That further research be conducted to determine the source of job dissatisfaction among 4-H and youth agents to reduce resignations.

3. That research be conducted on the relationship of work values in agent to clientele interaction.

4. That research be conducted on the relationship of work values to race in both faculty and agent to client interactions.

5. That further research be conducted to determine the source of dissatisfaction of home economics agents with the Herzberg factor of supervision.

6. That further research be conducted to determine the source of dissatisfaction of 4-H agents with the factors of working conditions and recognition.

7. That the Calloway inventory and adaptation be further tested for reliability and validity with revisions to increase validity for use with both county and state faculty.

8. That further research be conducted to determine the predictability of job satisfaction from values system orientation, especially the egocentric values system.

9. That further research be conducted to determine the source of variance in the Herzberg achievement factor.

LITERATURE CITED

Amend, Edwin H. "Supervision: Motivating, Not Controlling". Journal of Extension, VIII: 17-24. Winter, 1970.

Baier, Kurt. "The Concept of Value". Value Theory in Philosophy and Social Science, Ervin Lazlow and James B. Wilbur, editors. (Gordon and Breach Science Publishers), p. 1 1973.

Boone, Edgar J. "The Cooperative Extension Service". Handbook of Adult Education, Robert M. Smith, George F. Aker, and J. R. Kidd, editors, (New York: The MacMillan Company), p. 265. 1970.

Bruce, Robert L. and G. L. Carter, Jr. "Administrative Climate". Journal of Cooperative Extension, V: 7-14. Spring 1976.

Calloway, Pauline Frances. "An Analysis of Construct Validity of Motivation as it Relates to North Carolina County Agriculture Extension Service Agents". (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, North Carolina State University). 1968.

Federal Extension Service. A People And A Spirit. (A condensation of the report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension. Fort Collins: Printing and Publication Service, Colorado State University), p. 8. November 1968.

Flowers, Vincent S. and Charles L. Hughes. "Why Employees Stay". Harvard Business Review. p. 49. July-August 1973.

Flowers, Hughes, Myers and Myers. AMACOM. p. 14.

Giegold, William C. and William E. Skelton. "Pinpointing Morale Problems". Journal of Extension, XVI: 6-9. May-June 1976.

Ginsberg, Eli. "Man and His Work". Managing People at Work, Dale S. Breach, editor. (New York: MacMillan Company, Inc.). 1971.

Graves, Clare W. "Human Nature Prepares for a Momentous Leap". The Futurist. April 1974.

Literature Cited
(Continued)

Graves, Clare W. "Levels of Existence: An Open System Theory of Values". Journal of Humanistic Psychology, X: 131-155. 1970.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B. B. Snyderman. Motivation to Work. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1964.

Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. (Cleveland: The World Press). 1966.

Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "New Goals in Personnel". Management by Objectives Journal, Surry, England, 3(4): 26. 1974.

Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "Shaping Personnel Strategies to Disparate Value Systems". Personnel, p. 9. March-April 1973.

Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "Toward Existentialism in Management". The Conference Board Record, XII: 60-64. September 1975.

Katz, Daniel. "Field Studies". Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, L. Festinger and D. Katz, editors. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), p. 74. 1952.

King, Emily E. "Relationships of Personal Value Systems to a Measure of Job Satisfaction Among Personnel of the Florida Agricultural Extension Service". (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin), 1961.

Knowles, Malcolm S. "The Field of Operations in Adult Education". Adult Education - Outline of an Emerging Field of University Study, Gale Jensen, A.A. Liveright and Wilbur Hallenbeck, editors, (Adult Education Association of the USA), p. 44. 1964.

Maslow, Abraham. New Knowledge in Human Values. (New York: Harper). 1959.

Mees, Carl F. "County Extension Administration". Journal of Cooperative Extension, I: 85-92. Summer 1963.

Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. (New York: The Free Press, MacMillan), p. 5. 1973.

Williams, Robin. American Society. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), p. 374. 1957.

World Book Encyclopedia, (Chicago: Field Enterprise Educational Corporation). 1976.

APPENDIX I

Please Read First-Thoroughly

General Instructions

1. We are most grateful for your participation in this survey. There are no right or wrong answers. Please express your true feelings.

2. It is most important that each staff member complete the survey. There will be no attempt to identify individuals from the data in this survey. Please do not put your name on the survey instrument. A self-addressed envelope is provided in which you should seal the completed questionnaire. You will note there is a postcard provided, with a number that identifies you. Please mail this at the same time, but separately. This will help in following up questionnaires that have not been returned.

3. You will note that the survey can be completed rather quickly. Section 1 asks for limited personal data. Most of the responses will require only a simple check mark or circling of a number. The exception to this is the Values for Working survey form (Section 2).

4. The eight Values for Working questions are multiple choice with six possible responses to each question. For each question, please indicate how much you agree with each of the six responses by distributing 12 points among them. The more you agree with a response the more points you should assign to it. No points should be assigned to a statement to which you don't agree.

5. The job satisfaction inventory (Section 3) is an adaptation of one prepared for county staff. You'll note words in parentheses that have been inserted in some of the items to make the survey appropriate to state staff as well. You will note that two responses are requested for each item. In Column A you are asked to rate how satisfied you are with each statement according to the scale: 1 - very dissatisfied, 2 - dissatisfied, 3- satisfied, 4- very satisfied. In Column B please indicate if the item is important to you according to the scale: I - impor-

tant, ? - I'm not sure, N - Not important.

6. If you have difficulty in answering any questions, please give us your best estimate or appraisal. You may wish to clarify your answer by making a comment in the margin or on the back.

7. When you have completed the survey form, please recheck to make sure that no questions have been omitted. Please seal the completed survey form in the attached envelope and mail it as soon as possible. At the same time please mail the coded card separately.

8. Thank you again for your help. A summary of the findings will be available upon request.

Section 1

1. Your present job assignment?

____1. 4-H Agent

____2. Agricultural Agent

____3. Home Economics Agent

____4. Community and Resource Development Agent

____5. Specialist

____6. Administrator

____7. Supervisor

____8. Program Leader

____9. Department Head

2. County Chairperson?

____1. Yes

____2. No

3. Length of Employment in Extension?

1. Number of years ____ and months ____.

4. Your sex?

___1. Male

___2. Female

5. Your age?

____1. Under 30

____2. 30 to 39

____3. 40 to 49

____4. 50 to 59

5. (Continued)

____5. 60 or over

6. Level of formal education?

____1. Bachelor's degree only

____2. Bachelor's degree plus ____additional hours

____3. Master's degree

____4. Master's degree plus ____ additional hours

____5. Advanced Graduate Specialist

____6. Doctorate

7. Credit hours of education or other behavioral science courses?

1. Number of hours _____

SECTION 2

VALUES FOR WORKING

This questionnaire is adapted from a nationwide survey which provided much of the factual framework for an American Management Association report on "Managerial Values for Working," published in 1975 by Dr. Vincent S. Flowers, Dr. Charles L. Hughes, Dr. M. Scott Myers, and Susan S. Myers. Administration of this research instrument requires prior written permission of the authors.

DIRECTIONS: For each question, indicate how much you agree with each of the six statements by distributing 12 points among them. The more you agree with a statement, the more points you should assign to it. No points should be assigned to a statement to which you don't agree - leave those statements blank. The points you assign for the statements must total 12 for each question for a total of 96 for the eight questions.

1. TO ME, ORGANIZATIONAL LOYALTY MEANS -

.supporting the goals of the organization as long as they don't go against one's principles..... _____

.sticking with the organization through good years and bad, and making sacrifices when necessary to keep the organization strong..... _____

.giving up my freedom and being an apple-polisher..... _____

.being on the job as much as I can and doing what I'm told..... _____

.commitment to an organization that is concerned with the needs of its employees..... _____

.supporting the organization that lets me succeed..... _____

Total 12

2. THE KIND OF BOSS I LIKE IS ONE WHO -

.tells me exactly what to do and how to do it, and encourages me by doing it with me..... _____

.is tough but allows me to be tough too..... _____

.calls the shots and isn't always changing his mind, and sees to it that everyone follows the rules..... _____

.doesn't ask questions as long as I get the job done.... ___

.gets us working together in close harmony by being more a friendly person than a boss..... _____

.gives me access to the information I need and lets me do my job in my own way..... _____

Total 12

3. MONEY IS IMPORTANT TO ME BECAUSE -

.it enables me to enjoy many friendships and to support worthwhile causes..... _____

.it provides freedom and the opportunity to be myself; having money is not as important as what I do with it.. _____

.it allows me to buy the things I need, such as a sharp car and clothes, and makes me feel like somebody..... _____

.it allows me to save for a rainy day, to aid the less fortunate, and to have a decent standard of living..... _____

.it pays for groceries, the rent, and other things I need to keep going..... _____

.it is a measure of my career success in my organization and community..... _____

Total 12

4. IN MY OPINION, ORGANIZATION RULES ARE -

.useful only if they promote social and economic justice _____

.necessary to keep employees from doing the wrong things and protect us from people who want to break the rules. _____

.best when they are few, and effective if they succeed in putting the burden of responsibility on the employees.. _____

.made by the top management for the top management and many rules don't give the employee a chance..... _____

.necessary as guidelines, but sometimes it seems necessary to look for loopholes in order to get the job done..... _____

.necessary to preserve order in the organization and employees who violate the rules should be told how important it is to follow the rules..... _____

Total 12

5. MY WORK -

.I prefer work of my own choosing that offers continuing challenge and requires imagination and initiative, even if the pay isn't high..... _____

.I don't like any kind of work that ties me down, but I'll do it if I have to in order to get some money, then I'll quit and do what I want until I have to get another job _____

.the kind of work I usually do is o.k. as long as it's a steady job and I have a good boss..... _____

.I have worked hard for what I have, and think I deserve some good breaks. I believe others should realize it is their duty to be loyal to the organization if they want to get ahead..... _____

.I am reponsible for my own success, and I am always on the lookout for new opportunities which will lead to a more responsible position and greater financial reward..... _____

.I believe that doing what I like to do, such as working with people toward a common goal, is more important than getting caught up in a materialistic rat race.. _____

Total 12

6. JOB FREEDOM, FOR ME MEANS -

.the opportunity to work where I want and have a steady job..... _____

.the opportunity to do interesting and challenging work, to be able to express myself openly, and the freedom to change jobs if I want to..... _____

.having enough independence so I won't be pushed around by higher-ups in the organization..... _____

.the opportunity to be friends with anyone without worrying about where they fit into the organization. _____

.not having to worry about my job, sickness, paying bills, and other problems..... _____

.the opportunity to stand on my own two feet and to pursue success without too much interference from supervision or anything else..... _____

Total 12

7. I BELIEVE THAT BIG COMPANIES -

.and their employees should be dedicated to the goal of maximizing profits because both "win" when this goal is achieved....._____

.are doing their duty when they provide steady jobs and pay enough to allow employees to maintain a decent standard of living....._____

.make fat profits at the expense of most workers....._____

.are probably necessary in our world, but they must be more concerned with better balance between organizational and individual needs....._____

.should take good care of employees by giving them good pay, hours, and working conditions....._____

.should support the causes of social and economic justice, provide a pleasant work climate, share profits with employees, and become selective in choosing their products and customers....._____

Total 12

8. IN MY OPINION THE PROFIT A COMPANY MAKES -

.is its primary reason for existing and is the most important measure of success....._____

.goes to the people who already have a lot of money....._____

.keeps the organization strong so the employees can continue to have good jobs....._____

.is important but there isn't much I can do about it....._____

.is not as important as its products and services and the way it treats its people....._____

.will be greater in the long run when the needs of the employees and the organization both considered....._____

Total 12

CENTER FOR VALUES RESEARCH

Dr. Charles L. Hughes
13410 Mill Grove Lane
Dallas, Texas 75240

Dr. Vincent S. Flowers
106 Thompson Drive
Richardson, Texas 75080

SECTION 3

EXTENSION WORKER'S JOB SATISFACTION INVENTORY

Adopted from Calloway (1968) County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory

Please circle the number in column A that describes how satisfied you are with each item according to the scale.

1 - Very dissatisfied
2 - Dissatisfied
3 - Satisfied
4 - Very satisfied

Also please circle the letter in column B that describes how important each item is to you according to the scale:

I - Important
? - I'm not sure
N - Not important

How do you feel about the following statements?

	Column A	Column B
1. The actual adoption of recommended practices by people you work with in the county (or state).....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
2. The immediate results you see from your work.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
3. The competency of your supervisors (or department chairman) to give you meaningful assistance in your work.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
4. The informal setting of Extension work.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
5. The number of hours required each week in your job as compared to those in similar positions in other professions.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N

	Column A	Column B
6. The fringe benefits other than salary in Extension as compared to private industry.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
7. The extent to which you are expected to accept responsibilities for activities outside of your major area of interest.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
8. The type of work you do.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
9. The adequacy of on-the-job training in helping you understand your job responsibilities.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
10. The amount of recognition you receive as compared to your co-workers..	1 2 3 4	I ? N
11. The manner in which the staff is encouraged to work together.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
12. The degree to which Extension's policies are clear-cut enough to serve as guides for you in doing your work.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
13. The on-the-job supervision given you by your immediate supervisor (or department chairman).....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
14. The range in salaries paid Extension workers in your county (or department).....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
15. Working with and through local leaders (or agents) to get your job done.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
16. The number of organized groups you are responsible for as compared with your co-workers.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
17. The salary available to Extension workers as compared to similar people in private industry.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
18. The evaluation process which your supervisors (or department chairman) use to judge your effectiveness as an Extension worker.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
19. The number of organized groups for which you are directly responsible.	1 2 3 4	I ? N

		Column A	Column B
20.	The opportunities provided for increased responsibility in Extension..	1 2 3 4	I ? N
21.	The way you are involved in making policy decisions.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
22.	The latitude to exercise your own initiative in your position.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
23.	The extent to which your supervisors (or department chairman) acknowledge your outstanding performances.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
24.	The extent to which the goals in your county (or department) plan of work are usually achieved.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
25.	The opportunity for responsibility in helping plan the total county (or state) Extension program.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
26.	The salary you get as compared to the salaries people with similar training get in other professions.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
27.	The willingness of your immediate supervisor (or department chairman) to delegate responsibility.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
28.	Being able to objectively evaluate your accomplishments in Extension work.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
29.	The emphasis placed on graduate work in considering agents (or state staff) for advancement.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
30.	The opportunities for advancement in Extension as compared with those in private industry.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
31.	The way local people support the Extension program.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
32.	The recognition you receive from other organizations and agencies.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
33.	The extent to which you are informed by your superiors about Extension matters affecting you.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N

	Column A	Column B
34. Extension's educational philosophy which seems to prevail in this county (or department).....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
35. The recognition you get for your ideas and suggestions from the county staff (or departmental staff).....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
36. The counsel and guidance you get from your supervisors (or department chairman).....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
37. The method used in arriving at your salary.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
38. The extent to which people in the county (or agents) actually help in planning and carrying out your part of the total program.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
39. The number of night meetings required in your work.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
40. Your opportunities for advancement in Extension.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
41. The recognition given you by your co-workers for outstanding accomplishments in your county (or department).....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
42. Your advancement since you have been employed by Extension.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
43. The amount of time which is available to you for your personal professional growth.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
44. The amount of responsibility you have in your work.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
45. The authority you have to get your job done.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
46. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in reporting your accomplishments.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N
47. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in evaluating your accomplishments.....	1 2 3 4	I ? N

Please answer the following questions:

What is the MOST satisfying part of your job?

What is the LEAST satisfying part of your job?

If you need additional space please use the back of the page. THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE TO PANEL OF EXPERTS

In order to have an additional perspective of the management of the Cooperative Extension Service of Maryland, I'd appreciate it if you would read through the six following paragraphs and check the one you feel most adequately describes management of the MCES.

____A. In MCES, administration and supervision (management) tells what is expected of employees and maintains close, personal supervision of each person in the work group. To motivate employees to improve performance, management lets the employees know that if they can't do the extra work, he/she is always there to help them. Evaluation and employee counseling is an opportunity for the supervisor to tell employees if they have performed adequately and if they have let management down. In general, management in MCES does what the "higher ups" say and helps the employees when needed. Management communicates with employees by explaining employee requirements and rules and talking with them about their problems.

____B. In MCES, administration and supervision (management) sets the rules and lets employees know at all times who is in charge. To motivate employees to improve performance management keeps demanding improvement until employees perform adequately, because, otherwise, employees won't work hard enough. Evaluation and employee counseling is a waste of time with employees resenting supervisors finding fault with them and telling them how to act. In general, management in MCES determines what policies are to be followed and makes sure employees do it their way. Management communicates with employees by telling them whatever management feels like telling them.

___C. In MCES, administration and supervision (management) enforces the organizational rules and policies diligently in order to avoid discipline problems and improve working conditions for everyone. To motivate employees to improve performance, management makes sure employees understand what is expected of them by maintaining up-dated, clear and detailed job descriptions. Evaluation and employee counseling is a system whereby supervisors explain MCES goals and policies and how employees can support them. In general, management in MCES administers the organization's rules and regulations in a consistent and "firm but fair" manner. Management communicates with employees by giving them the information they should have and keeping relations in a businesslike manner.

___D. In MCES, administration and supervision (management) utilizes employees in maximizing and achieving personal goals. To motivate employees to improve performance management lets the employees know what's in it for them in terms of future financial reward and greater job responsibility. Evaluation and employee counseling is an opportunity for employees to set their own goals and get recognition for achieving them. In general, management in MCES tries to maximize productivity because that's the name of the game for getting ahead. Management communicates with employees by giving them the information employees need to get the job done.

___E. In MCES, administration and supervision (management) creates a pleasant, supportive and warm work environment and treats all people as being equal regardless of where they fit in the organization. To motivate employees to improve performance, management tries to provide an open and supportive work environment where employees are able to relate to each other as human beings. Evaluation and employee counseling is an occasion for supervisors to get better acquainted with all the employees. In general, management in MCES tries to create a feeling that everyone is equal in the organization and avoid anything that causes hard feelings. Management communicates with employees by staying on good terms with employees so they will feel free to discuss anything they want.

____F. In MCES, administration and supervision (management) allows an open environment where everybody can develop and achieve their personal goals with minimum supervision. To motivate employees to improve performance, management provides a flexible environment where employees have the opportunity to express themselves openly and plan and control their own work. Evaluation and employee counseling is handled as a problem-solving process where both employee personal needs and MCES goals can be better met. In general, management in MCES acts only in a resource capacity because the best way to reach organizational goals is to allow employees to realize their own goals in their own way. Management communicates informally and gives employees free access to information they want.